

McCumber Meconium questions

12-11-19

1. What response did you receive at health working group meeting to the presentation? Overall the response was grateful that EPA is taking the lead on evaluating this new information. I believe Dr. Hailer was on the call. Were either McDermott or Read on the call? No Have you heard from them subsequently? Yes Proffessor Lead contacted me about 4:23 am on Tuesday morning after the Working Group Meeting. Lead expressed some concerns about sharing the data and I responded to him this morning requesting additional data.
2. Is it true that Hailer, McDermott, Read et al or any of them individually have refused to share leftover samples or datasets with you? No, all authors have expressed concern and have been accomidating so far. EPA has yet to have a response on the SC data, Katie Hailer sent some initial laboratory data on 12-10-19, and EPA will have further questions and requests.
3. What is the current status of this? see above
4. If you do not get the samples/data, what are your next steps? Our next steps is to move forward with a thorough review of what we do have and continue to pursue what we don't.
5. Have you talked with Arbuckle or any of the other scientists involved in the MIREC study? Yes, Charlie?
6. Do Hailer, McDermott, et al know specifically who peer-reviewed their material? Don't know Do you? No
7. Specifically, what response did you get from the researchers as to your conclusion that all of the Butte levels fall into the range of other published levels found at not-necessarily-polluted localities? We have not received a response
8. Have you talked with NIEH about why the institute did not fund the grant request from the researchers for a larger study? No
9. Have you seen the McDermott brain-tumor study that is apparently about to be published? No, but we have heard its coming
10. Taken as a whole, the McDermott research – the mortality studies, the meconium study, and the apparently soon-to-be-published brain tumor study – all have raised and will raise levels of concern about Butte and Anaconda's overall health. Do you take issue with the way these studies have been presented to the public by McDermott and others? The issue is that local, State, and Federal agencies have not been coordinated with and each have experts that should be involved with any real public health concern based on real data. In some ways, though, doesn't that concern make it all the more imperative that the decades-long shadow of health concern that falls on Butte be definitively swept aside by a thoroughgoing ATSDR study, similar to what was done in Anaconda? The data speaks for itself and if the data is validated and real then action may or may not be necessary Can you comment about whether such a study is currently contemplated (or provided for in the CD)? At this time the only Health Study required is the biomonitoring health study conducted every 5 years, specific to lead at this time.
11. I understand CDC/ATSDR was also on the call. Are you working directly with scientists there? Yes and No, both coordination and independence Who are they? Scott Sudwicks and ? By any chance can you direct me to the correct person within that agency to query for this story? Charlie?
12. Given the public agencies, including EPA that were represented on the health working group, shouldn't those meetings be public? They are a superfund remedial action technical meeting, and are not private. I know that Atlantic Richfield is the convenor in a way, but without public

access doesn't that color the perception of what this group is? No, local citizens, local MDs, epidemiologists, toxicologists, engineers, risk assessors , CTEC representatives, etc. are a part of the working group.